



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,161	05/03/2006	Marc Chaussade	1022702-000127	4380
21830 7590 12/18/2008 BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC POST OFFICE BOX 1404 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404				
EXAMINER				
OJURONGBE, OLATUNDE S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/18/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/541,161

Applicant(s)

CHAUSSADE ET AL.

Examiner

OLATUNDE S. OJURONGBE

Art Unit

1796

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 October 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 16-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 AND 16-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20060920; 20060509; 20050630.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application.
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment to the claims filed in response to the restriction/election of species requirement filed on 10/29/2008 has been entered. Claims 1-12 and 16-31 remain pending in the application.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. **Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 20 and 21** are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-15 of copending Application No. 10/541,139. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

Claim 1 of the copending application US 10/541,139 claims a method for preparing a suspension of a silicic particulate filler in a silicone material (SM) comprising:...

this method being of the type in which an aqueous suspension of silicic particulate filler is made hydrophobic by treating with at least one halogenated reagent, this treatment comprising a transfer of the silica made hydrophobic into a nonaqueous phase and at least one step for at least partial removal of water;...

... CA // (Route II); or selected from R^C -substituted halogenosilanes with $R^C =$ hydrogen, C1-C30 alkyl, C2-C30 alkenyl, aryl, and R^C being optionally substituted according to route II:

(IIa)-- an aqueous silica suspension is prepared or used which comprises:

silica,

[water which is optionally acidified,

at least one hydrogen bond stabilizer,

(IIb)-- optionally, part of the silicone material SM is incorporated into the aqueous silica suspension obtained at the end of step IIa),

(IIc)-- hydrophobic units formed by $-Si-(R^C)_{1 \text{ to } 3}$ with $R^C =$ hydrogen, C1-30 alkyl, C2-C30 alkenyl, aryl, these groups R^C being optionally substituted, are grafted onto the silica by exposing this silica to halosilane type CA // acting as precursors of these units and by allowing the reaction to proceed, optionally while stirring the whole, and optionally in the hot state,

(IIId)-- the procedure is carried out such that the transfer of the silica grafted by hydrophobic units, from the aqueous phase to the nonaqueous phase, is carried out,

(IIe)-- optionally, at least part of the aqueous phase and of the reaction by-products is drawn off,

(II_f)-- the medium is cooled if necessary,

(II_g)-- optionally, the residual acidity of the nonaqueous phase is washed off,

(II_h)-- the totality or the remainder of the silicone material SM is mixed with the filler which is now hydrophobic,

(II_i)-- the residual water is evaporated off,

(II_j)-- and an oil is recovered which comprises a hydrophobic particulate filler suspension in a crosslinkable silicone material, preferably optionally without ever passing through dried hydrophobic silica,

the routes I and II leading to an oil (or slurry) comprising a suspension of hydrophobic particulate filler in a crosslinkable silicone material;

The instant claim 1 claims a similar method.

Though the instant claim 1 does not claim the method comprising SM1-SM4, the examiner notes that these are species of the SM claimed by the instant application.

Though the instant claim 1 does not claim the method according to route I, the examiner notes that this only makes claim 1 of the copending application US 10/541,139 broader, thereby encompassing the instant claim 1.

Therefore, the instant claim 1 is unpatentable over claim 1 of copending application No. US 10/541,139.

The instant claims 3, 5-7 and 20-21 are not patentably distinct from the corresponding claims or combination of claims 2-15 of the copending application No. US 10/541,139.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Specification

3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The use of the trademark, for example, Irgafos on page 4, line 15, has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Page 31, line 13 recites $(\text{CH}_3)\text{SiCl}$ instead of $(\text{CH}_3)_3\text{SiCl}$.

Page 31, lines 23-24 recites dialkylhydrogenohalomonosilanes, for example $(\text{CH}_3)_2\text{SiCl}_2$; the chemical formula does not conform to the species of silanes cited.

The definition for a in general formula (3) on page 41, lines 25-26, is omitted.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. **Claims 1-9, 12, and 16-28** are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 recites "...formed by $=\text{Si}(\text{R}^c)_{1 \text{ to } 3}$, where $\text{R}^c = \text{hydrogen}, \dots$ ", whereas on page 33, line 1 of the instant specification, " $\text{R}^c = \text{hydrogeno}, \dots$ "; though hydrogen and hydrogen are synonyms that are used interchangeably in the art, for consistency purposes, a radical should be identified by the same term throughout the disclosure.

Dependent claims 2-9, 12 and 16-28 are objected to for similar reason.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1, 3,5-9,12,16, and 18-19, 21-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Burns et al, (US 6,184,408)** .

Regarding **claims 1 and 22**, Burns et al teaches a method of contacting an aqueous suspension of silica with (2) an organosilicon compound selected from the group which includes organosilanes described by formula (1), in the presence of (3) a water-miscible organic solvent (col.2, lines 25-45), and subsequent addition of water-immiscible organic solvent to effect separation of the hydrophobic silica from the aqueous solution(col.6, lines 30-38). Burns et al further teaches that the method comprises contacting an aqueous suspension of silica with a catalytic amount of an acid and organosilicon selected from the groups which includes organosilanes described by formula (1), in the presence of (3) a water-miscible organic solvent, and addition of water-immiscible organic solvent to effect separation of the hydrophobic silica from the aqueous solution (col.6, lines 30-38). Burns et al further exemplifies the method as: (i) silica was formed by neutralizing a sodium silicate solution and then filtering and washing among other steps, followed by placing some of the formed silica filter cake in

a flask and adding deionized water and isopropyl alcohol to the flask followed by; (ii) the addition of dimethyldichlorosilane; (iii) concentrated HCl, isopropyl alcohol and hexamethyldisiloxane were added to the flask; (iv) toluene was added to the flask and the aqueous phase was drained from the flask; (v) deionized water and additional toluene were added to the flask and the aqueous phase was again drained from the flask; (vi) the flask content was refluxed to remove water by azeotropic distillation; (vii) the resulting slurry was poured into a pan (col.13, lines 15-43).

By adding deionized water and isopropyl alcohol to the silica filter cake of Burns et al, an aqueous silica suspension is formed; the isopropyl alcohol of Burns et al serves as the at least one hydrogen bond stabilizer/initiator of the instant claim; this step of Burns et al labeled (i) above, satisfies the claim limitation (a) of the instant claim.

The combination of addition of dimethyldichlorosilane to the mixture labeled (ii) above, and the addition of toluene to the flask, labeled (iv) above, satisfies the claim limitation (c) of the instant claim.

By adding the dimethyldichlorosilane to the mixture, a modified hydrophobic silica filler is produced by grafting hydrophobic units formed by $\text{Si}-(\text{CH}_3)_2$ onto the silica and the toluene of Burns et al serves as a nonaqueous phase to which the silica comprising the grafted hydrophobic units is transferred from the aqueous phase of the instant claim.

The addition of hexamethyldisiloxane labeled (iii) above, serves as the mixing the totality of the silicone material SM with the modified hydrophobic silica filler of the instant claim.

The refluxing to remove water by azeotropic distillation labeled (vi) above serves as the removing the residual water by evaporation of the instant claim. Removal of water by azeotropic distillation is a process that involves evaporation of water.

The resulting slurry of Burns et al serves as the oil which comprises a hydrophobic particulate filler suspension of the modified hydrophobic silica filler in a crosslinkable silicone material of the instant claim. The hexamethyldisiloxane serves as the crosslinkable silicone material of the instant claim.

Regarding **claims 3, 18 and 19**, the sodium silicate solution of Burns et al as taught in the step labeled (i) above, serves as the at least one precursor of silicone resin of the instant claim.

Regarding **claims 5, 16 and 21**, Burns et al further teaches the silica as precipitated silica with BET surface area preferably within a range of about $100 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ to $500 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ (col.4, lines 24-28); and exemplifies a BET surface area of $337 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$ (col.13, lines 19-21) and further teaches that the hydrophobic precipitated silica is added to the present method as an aqueous suspension of hydrophilic; the concentration of hydrophilic precipitated silica in the aqueous suspension is within a range of about 4 to 50 weight percent. Since the viscosity of water is at 25°C is 1 mPa.s , an aqueous suspension of hydrophilic precipitated silica with a concentration of hydrophobic precipitated silica of about 4 to 50 weight percent has a viscosity that is less than 300 Pa.s or 150 Pa.s .

Regarding **claim 6**, the water-miscible organic solvent of Burns et al exemplified as isopropyl alcohol, which serves as the hydrogen bond stabilizer/initiator of the instant claim, is an organic solvent.

Regarding **claim 7**, by the addition of HCl to the mixture, as taught by Burns et al in the step labeled as (iii) above, Burns et al teaches acidifying the aqueous suspension. HCl is an acid.

Regarding **claim 8**, the exemplified hexamethyldisiloxane of Burns et al serves as at least one oligoorganosiloxane of the instant claim.

Regarding **claim 9**, the exemplified dimethyldichlorosilane of Burns et al serves as the precursor of the hydrophobic units of the instant claim; dimethyldichlorosilane is an alkylhalosilane.

Regarding **claims 12**, the silica of the exemplified method of Burns et al is precipitated silica filter cake of 11.8 wt% solids (col.13, lines 21-22); this teaches a precipitated silica slurry.

Regarding **claims 23-24**, the exemplified acid added to the mixture of Burns et al is concentrated HCl (col.13, line 29); this step of Burns et al serves as the acidification of the aqueous suspension (aqueous phase) of the instant claim.

Regarding **claims 25-26**, Burns et al exemplifies hexamethyldisiloxane (col.13, line 30), which serves as the SM of the instant claim.

Regarding **claim 27**, Burns et al exemplifies dimethyldichlorosilane (col.13, lines 26-27), which serves as the alkylchlorosilane of the instant claim.

Regarding **claim 28**, Burns et al further teaches examples of useful organosilicon compounds for the invention to include trimethylchlorosilane (col.5, line 67).

Regarding **claim 29**, Burns et al exemplifies isopropyl alcohol, which serves as the at least one hydrogen bond stabilizer/initiator of the instant claim.

Regarding **claim 30**, Burns et al exemplifies 15.9g of dimethyldichlorosilane (col. 13, lines 26-27), which teaches 18g of the dimethyldichlorosilane per 100g of the silica. The dimethyldichlorosilane of Burns et al serves as the precursor of $\text{Si}-(\text{R}^{\text{C}})_{1 \text{ to } 3}$ of the instant claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

9. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

10. **Claims 2, 4, 10-11, 17, 20 and 31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Burns et al (US 6,184,408)**.

Regarding **claim 2**, Burns et al teaches all the claim limitations as set forth above and further teaches that it is more preferred that the acid catalyst provides a pH less than about pH 3 (col.4, lines 53-55). Though Burns et al does not teach the method wherein the pH of the suspension is ≤ 2 of the instant claim, it has been established that in the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art a prima facie case of obviousness exists.

Regarding **claims 4 and 20**, Burns et al teaches all the claim limitations as set forth above; though Burns et al does not teach the method further comprising grafting functional units other than hydrophobic units onto silica by exposing the silica to halosilane precursors of these functional grafts of the instant claim, Burns et al further teaches that in the present method, the aqueous suspension of hydrophilic precipitated silica is contacted with one or more of the organosilicon compounds described by formulas (1), (2) and (3) and further teaches examples of the organosilicon compounds to include methylphenyldichlorosilane (col.5, line 60); since the list of organosilicon compound of Burns et al is limited, motivated by the desire to optimize the hydrophobic property of the silica, one of ordinary skill in the art would have formed various versions of the composition of col.13, lines 15-43, including one in which methylphenyldichlorosilane is incorporated into the method by routine experimentation, with an expectation of success..

By incorporating the methylphenyldichlorosilane into the method of col.13, lines 15-43, the phenyl functional unit of the methylphenyldichlorosilane is grafted unto the silica. The phenyl unit of Burns et al is chromophoric

Regarding **claim 10**, Burns et al teaches a method for the preparation of hydrophobic precipitated silica (abstract); said method comprises contacting an aqueous suspension of a precipitated silica with a catalytic amount of acid and an organosilicon compound selected from the group which includes organosilanes described by the formula (1) in

the presence of (3) a water-miscible organic solvent (col.2, lines 25-45) and exemplifies the method as:

(i) precipitated silica filter cake were placed in a flask, with stirring, deionized water and isopropyl alcohol were added to the flask (col.13, lines 22-24); the isopropyl alcohol serves as the hydrogen bond stabilizer/initiator of the instant claim;

(ii) dimethyldichlorosilane was added to the flask (col.13, lines 26-27); the dimethyldichlorosilane of Burns et al serves as halosilanes that are a precursor of the hydrophobic units of the instant claim

(iii) the resulting mixture was heated at 65°C (col.13, line 27);

(iv) hexamethyldisiloxane was added to the flask (col.13, line 29);

(v) the aqueous phase was drain from the flask (col.13, line 33); this serves as a combination of steps (d) and (e) of the instant claim;

(vi) the resulting slurry was poured into shallow pans(col.13, lines 15-40); this serves as step h of the instant claim.

Though Burns et al does not teach the step (g) of the instant claim, step (f) on which step (g) depends is optional.

Though Burns et al does not teach the method wherein the hexamethyldisiloxane was added to the flask before the resulting mixture was heated, the examiner notes that selection of any order of performing process steps is *prima facie* obvious in the absence of new or unexpected results; selection of any order of mixing ingredients is *prima facie* obvious.

Regarding **claim 11**, Burns et al exemplifies 763g of the precipitated silica filter cake containing 11.8 wt% solids (col.13, line 22); this teaches 90 g of the silica; 15.9g of dimethyldichlorosilane (col.13, line 26), this teaches 18g of the dimethyldichlorosilane per 100g of the silica; a total of 1,350 ml of water (1.1L + 250ml, col. 13, lines 24-34), which corresponds to 1,350g of water and 1,500g of water per 100 of the silica.

Burns et al further teaches that the amount of water-immiscible organic solvent, including hexamethyldisiloxane, added to the present method should provide a solvent to silica weight ratio greater than about 0.05:1 and that more preferred is a solvent to silica weight ratio within a range of about 0.1:1 to 10:1 (col.6, lines 39-60); though Burns et al does not teach the SM oil : 40 to 2,000 of the instant claim, it has been established that in the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art a prima facie case of obviousness exists.

The limitation of claim 10, on which acid: 20 to 60 claim limitation of 11 depends is optional.

Regarding **claim 17**, Burns et al teaches all the claim limitations as set forth above and further teaches that it is more preferred that the acid catalyst provides a pH less than about pH 3 (col.4, lines 53-55). Though Burns et al does not teach the method wherein the pH of the suspension is ≤ 1 , at least during step (a) of the instant claim, it has been established that in the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art a prima facie case of obviousness exists.

Regarding **claim 31**, Burns et al exemplifies 763g of the precipitated silica filter cake containing 11.8 wt% solids; this teaches an amount of 90 g of the silica; 15.9g of dimethyldichlorosilane, which teaches 18g of the dimethyldichlorosilane per 100g of the silica; a total of 1,350 ml of water, which corresponds to 1,350g of water and 1,500g of water per 100 of the silica.

Burns et al further teaches that the present method requires the presence of a water-miscible organic solvent, preferably isopropanol (isopropyl alcohol), in preferably at least 5 weight percent of the aqueous suspension comprising the hydrophilic precipitated silica (col.4, line 66-col.5, line 10). Though Burns et al does not teach the H bond stabilizer/initiator: 1 to 10 of the instant claim, it has been established that in the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists.

Burns et al further teaches that the amount of water-immiscible organic solvent, including hexamethyldisiloxane, added to the present method should provide a solvent to silica weight ratio greater than about 0.05:1 and that more preferred is a solvent to silica weight ratio within a range of about 0.1:1 to 10:1 (col.6, lines 39-60); though Burns et al does not teach the SM oil : 40 to 2,000 of the instant claim, in the case where the claimed ranges overlap or lie inside ranges disclosed by the prior art a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists.

Conclusion

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLATUNDE S. OJURONGBE whose telephone number is (571)270-3876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7.15am-4.45pm, EST time, Alt Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on (571)272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

O.S.O

/Margaret G. Moore/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

12/15/08